

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 49

March 16, 1999, 2:16 p.m.  
Page S-2707 Temp. Record

## NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE/Discretionary Funding

**SUBJECT:** National Missile Defense Act of 1999 . . . S. 257. Cochran amendment No. 69.

### ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 99-0

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 257, the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, will make it the policy of the United States "to deploy as soon as technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate)."

**The Cochran amendment** would add that funding for such a system would be discretionary (subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for National Missile Defense).

**Those favoring** the amendment contended:

Argument 1:

Deteriorating conditions in Russia, nuclear espionage against the United States by China, missile tests by North Korea and Iran, and numerous other alarming developments in the past few years have made it somewhat embarrassing for our liberal colleagues to claim that the United States does not face a real and growing threat from ballistic missile attack. They have therefore come up with a few new arguments to justify leaving Americans defenseless from missiles armed with nuclear, biological, or chemical warheads. One of those new arguments is that by passing this resolution we will somehow short-circuit the authorization and appropriations process, making the deployment of a missile defense system a new entitlement program that is out of Congress' control.

We do not know how anyone could reasonably interpret the language of this resolution in that manner. The resolution does not even begin to address the type of missile defense system that should be deployed. All it would do is take the first step of making it the United States' policy to deploy a defense. We have had constant testing for years. Numerous technologies have been proven, but as soon as they have been liberals have blocked their development and deployment in favor of new testing of other technologies. The

(See other side)

YEAS (99)				NAYS (0)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republican (55 or 100%)		Democrats (44 or 100%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchinson	Akaka	Kennedy				Feinstein- <sup>3</sup>
Allard	Hutchison	Baucus	Kerrey				
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Bayh	Kerry				
Bennett	Jeffords	Biden	Kohl				
Bond	Kyl	Bingaman	Landrieu				
Brownback	Lott	Boxer	Lautenberg				
Bunning	Lugar	Breaux	Leahy				
Burns	Mack	Bryan	Levin				
Campbell	McCain	Byrd	Lieberman				
Chafee	McConnell	Cleland	Lincoln				
Cochran	Murkowski	Conrad	Mikulski				
Collins	Nickles	Daschle	Moynihan				
Coverdell	Roberts	Dodd	Murray				
Craig	Roth	Dorgan	Reed				
Crapo	Santorum	Durbin	Reid				
DeWine	Sessions	Edwards	Robb				
Donnenici	Shelby	Feingold	Rockefeller				
Enzi	Smith, Bob	Graham	Sarbanes				
Fitzgerald	Smith, Gordon	Harkin	Schumer				
Frist	Snowe	Hollings	Torricelli				
Gorton	Specter	Inouye	Wellstone				
Gramm	Stevens	Johnson	Wyden				
Grams	Thomas						
Grassley	Thompson						
Gregg	Thurmond						
Hagel	Voinovich						
Hatch	Warner						
Helms							

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Compiled and written by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee—Larry E. Craig, Chairman

United States has had the ability for years to deploy a missile defense. All it has lacked is the political will.

Three years ago, after vetoing a bill that would have made it the United States' policy to build a system to protect American civilians from a limited ballistic missile attack, the Clinton Administration came up with its "3+3" plan. Under that plan, it said that it would continue research for 3 years, and would make a decision at the end of the third year that would allow it to deploy a system within the next 3 years, should it finally decide that it was a good idea to build a defense. We are nearing the end of the third year. In less than a year, the Clinton Administration is supposed to give an answer.

We do not have to wait that long, though. It has already indicated that it will not have a system built until at least 2005. The reason for the delay is that Clinton Administration has started pursuing research into one of the more costly and ineffective options that has been proposed while at the same time it has cut funding for more effective, cheaper options that could be deployed almost immediately. We doubt very much that President Clinton will make a decision to deploy in 2000. He will say a little more research needs to be done, and that the decision on whether or not to deploy, with a completion date of 2005, will be put off until 2002 or some other date. Frankly, we do not have any trust in this President. We very much doubt that he has any intention of ever deploying any missile defense system. We believe his current efforts are just delaying tactics. That opinion is strengthened by the fact that he is once again lobbying strongly against our efforts to change his policy against deploying a missile defense.

Our Democratic colleagues have suggested that tens of billions of dollars may be required to build an effective defense. They are wrong. For example, both the Navy and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization have estimated that increasing funding for the Aegis Upper-Tier program by just \$300 million per year would make it possible to have a deployed missile defense system by as early as 2003. President Clinton has spent more than \$12 billion in his unauthorized military foray into Bosnia. He spent more than \$1 billion on an unauthorized bombing of Iraq less than a year ago, and more than \$1 billion on an unauthorized bombing of Sudan also less than a year ago, and tens of millions of Americans think that he carried out those attacks in an effort to escape trial for committing perjury and obstruction of justice. Our liberal colleagues have not seemed very worried about the authorization and appropriations process for the costs of the above actions taken by the President, though we think that the benefits that have come from them are questionable. We do not think that the benefits that would come from a missile defense are questionable, though. More than 50 million Americans along the West Coast are now vulnerable to missiles from China, and a Chinese general recently threatened to blow up Los Angeles if the United States tried to defend Taiwan from an attack by China. Also, North Korea either has or will soon have the capability to strike targets along the West Coast, and its fanatical leadership has never shown any restraint in the past in using its military capabilities. Alaska and Hawaii are also threatened by those two countries, and all Americans are vulnerable to an accidental or unauthorized missile launch from Russia. We quite frankly are willing to spend tens of billions of dollars on building a defense system to protect Americans from these very real dangers.

We want to be involved in making sure that we deploy an effective missile defense system as soon as possible. It is absurd to argue that we in any way favor handing a blank check to this Administration. If we were to follow that tack we imagine an awful lot of money would be spent on an awful lot of testing without a system ever being deployed. Still, we have no objection to putting into this resolution the fact that Congress intends to be fully engaged in the authorization and appropriations process in order to see this project through to completion. We especially have no objection if doing so will take away one of the new excuses being used to oppose this bill.

#### Argument 2:

This resolution, as reported, states that it is the policy of the United States to deploy an effective missile defense system as soon as it is technologically possible. The United States should not adopt such a blind policy. It only allows one factor to be considered--can an effective system be built? The resolution also says it must be technologically possible, but if it is effective than obviously it is possible, so that is not really a requirement. The danger from ballistic missile attacks quite clearly is greater than defense and intelligence experts were predicting only a few years ago, but that does not mean that it is the only danger our country faces. For instance, we still believe that if a rogue regime like Iraq decided to use a weapon of mass destruction against the United States it would be much more likely to try to smuggle that weapon into the United States, and perhaps use a terrorist group as a front, than it would be to launch a missile. If it launched a missile it would be subject to massive retaliation because we would be able to pinpoint exactly where that missile came from using intelligence means. If it used a terrorist group as a front, though, it would have much more plausible deniability and it might thus escape retaliation. Our point is that the United States' policy should be to use the limited resources it has to protect itself as best it can from all possible threats. We could spend our entire defense budget on building an ABM system, and leave ourselves totally defenseless against all other threats. That would obviously be a foolish and dangerous policy. Consideration of an ABM system must be made in the context of considering all other defense funding needs, including the need of funding arms control and nuclear weapon dismantlement programs. This amendment would make clear that funding for a national missile defense system will be done through the normal authorization and appropriations process, which will make sure that funding for it is weighed against funding for other priorities. We are pleased to support this amendment.

**No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.**